



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/369,281 08/06/99 SILVERBROOK

K 169.0013-DI

EXAMINER

005514 WM02/1205
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK NY 10112

NGUYEN, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED:

12/05/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

ms

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/369,281

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK

Examiner

Phu K. Nguyen

Group Art Unit

2671



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 18, 2000

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 84-93 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 84-93 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2400

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2772

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 84-93 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-84 of U. S. Patent No. 6,020,894 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The compressed image is stored as a plurality of bands in which multiple passes over the bands are used to manipulate the image.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Art Unit: 2772

3. Claims 85-93 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 81-84 of U. S. Patent No. 6,020,894 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: the compressed image data are stored in the bands which are processed to manipulate the image.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 84-93 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bantz et al. (US 4,679,038) in view of Gonzalez-Lopez (4,862,154).

As per claim 1, Band teaches the "method of creating an image" comprising the step of multiple passing the bands to manipulate the image (Bantz, figure 1). It is noted that Bantz does not explicitly teach that the data stored in the bands are "compressed" as claimed. However,

Art Unit: 2772

Bantz' bitmap memory 102 which stores the image bands suggests any step to efficiently store the image in the bitmap memory can be used such as compression for efficiently utilizing the memory space. Furthermore, Gonzalez-Lopez teaches that storing the image in compressed form to reduce the required memory is well known in the art (see Gonzalez-Lopez, figure 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Gonzalez-Lopez, to configure Bantz' method as claimed by compressing the stored data before load them into the memory to save the memory.

Claim 85 adds into claim 84 the step of compressing and editing the stored image which are well known in a computer graphic system such as Bantz.

Due to the similarity of claims 86-93 to claims 84-85 they are rejected under a similar reason.

Accordingly, the claimed invention as represented in the claims does not represent a patentable distinction over the art of record.

5. Due to new ground of the rejection cited above, this action has been made NON-FINAL.

Conclusion

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703)-308-9051 (**formal** communications intended for entry), Or:

Art Unit: 2772

(703)-305-9724 (informal communications labeled **PROPOSED** or **DRAFT**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703)-305-9796 and can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 6:30 AM to 3 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Phu K. Nguyen

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2671


PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2400